

## REMARKS

The final Office Action issued 31 March 2003 has been reviewed and the comments of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 2 and 13 have been rewritten into independent form and claims 16-19 have been added. Thus, claims 1-19 remain pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration by the Examiner.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by European Patent No. 0 415 489 to Du Pont De Nemours (Moussie). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following comments.

New independent claim 16 recites “a mounting member” and “an electrical component member including a first electrical connector adapted to be connected to a mating second electrical connector member.” Support for these combinations of features are found in Applicants’ specification and drawings as originally filed, for example, at page 4, lines 26-27, page 5, lines 23-26 and Figs. 2-4.

In contrast to the Applicants’ claimed combination of features, Moussie shows in Figs. 1, 3 and 4 and describes in column 3, line 56 through column 4, line 1, a cable connector 1 and a mating built-in connector 4 that “can be either the type with plug pins or one with plug sockets.” Moussie’s cable connector 1 has locking lips 3 that cooperate with recessed parts 24, 26 and transverse walls 25 on the mating built-in connector 4 to connect the cable connector 1 to the built-in connector. Moussie fails to show or describe how the built-in connector 4 is mounted to the un-illustrated electronic equipment. Therefore, Moussie does not show or describe at least the claimed features of a mounting member and an electrical component member connected to the mounting member and the electrical component member adapted to be connected to a mating electrical component member and claim 16 is patentable over Moussie.

Dependent claims 17-19 depend from allowable claim 16 and recite further features of the invention. For at least these reasons, claims 17-19 are also in condition for allowance.

Rewritten independent claim 2 recites at least the feature of “at least one second projection fixed to the first member and extending parallel to the plane, each second projection including a pair of second faces slidably engaging respective ones of the pair of grooves and preventing relative displacement of the first and second members perpendicular to the plane” and independent claim 11 recites “a pair of second projections fixed to the first member and

extending parallel to the plane, each second projection having at least two second faces slidably engaging corresponding surfaces in respective ones of the pair of grooves to prevent relative displacement of the first and second members perpendicular to the plane.” Similarly, rewritten independent claim 13 recites the feature of “providing the first member with a pair of second projections extending parallel to the plane, each second projection including a pair of second faces slidably engaging respective ones of the pair of grooves such that the first and second members are prevented from relative displacement perpendicular to the plane.”

The Office Action asserts that Moussie shows in Fig. 3 a second pair of projections, one projection on either side of the locking lips 3. Applicants respectfully point out that the structure on either side of the locking lips 3 does not project from the housing 2 and fails to provide the claimed features of “at least a second projection” (claim 2), “a second pair of projections” (claim 11), and “providing the first member with a second pair of projections.”

Assuming *arguendo*, the portions of the housing 2 of Moussie provide projections, then Moussie still fails to show or describe that the projections have second faces slidably engaging respective ones of the pair of grooves, as recited in each of claims 2, 11, and 13. Applicants respectfully point out that: (1) the portions of the housing 2 on either side of the locking lips 3 are positioned outside of the perimeter of the recessed parts 24, 26; and (2) the portions are spaced from the recesses parts 24, 26 when the connectors 1,4 are connected together. Therefore, these portions of the housing 2 do not slidably engage the recessed parts 24, 26 and Moussie does not show or describe at least these features of claims 2, 11 and 13. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection and indication of allowance of claims 2, 11 and 13.

Dependent claims 3-5 depend from allowable claim 2 and recite further features of the invention. For at least these reasons, claims 3-5 are also in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 1, 12 and 15 each recite combinations of features that include “each first projection including a pair of first faces” and each of a pair of grooves “including at least two surfaces slidably confronting respective ones of the pair of first faces and preventing relative displacement of the first and second members perpendicular to the plane.”

The Office Action alleges that the connectors 1, 4 of Moussie provide structure to dampen vibration. Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully point out that Moussie fails to provide written description support for vibration damping. Further,

Applicants respectfully point out that Figs. 3-4 of Moussie show that the collars 12, 17 of the connectors 1, 4 are configured for a close fit and, thus, vibration damping may not be provided by the locking lips 3. Absent description in Moussie to the contrary, the position of the Office Action is not supported by the disclosure of Moussie. Thus, independent claims 1, 12 and 15 are respectfully submitted to be allowable over the applied prior art, and the rejections thereof should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 6-10 and 14 depend from allowable claims 1, 12 and 15, respectively, and recite further features of the invention. For at least these reasons, claims 6-10 and 14 are also in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this Application and the prompt allowance of pending claims 1-19. Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if there are any issues that can be resolved via telephone conference.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. §1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Date: 30 July 2003

By:



William G. Battista, Jr.  
Reg. No. 37,525

**Customer No.: 009629**

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel. 202.739.3000  
Fax. 202.739.3001